

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 23, 2004, has been carefully considered and all claims have been amended to require that the hexagonal portion of applicant's glow plug extend all the way to the base. This provides a hexagonal base which utilizes the maximum outside dimension of the glow plug to provide a maximum of contact surface between the base of the glow plug and the block into which it is threadably secured.

The examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 as anticipated by Brooks, et al. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to define the base 40 so that the base of the plug is a portion which contacts the engine block. As shown in Figure 4, this base will contact an engine block when the glow plug is threadably secured to the engine block. Amended claim 1 also requires that the hexagonal portion extends downwardly to terminate in contact with the engine block contactable base. This provides a hexagonally shaped contact area which is cross-hatched in Figure 6 of applicant's drawings. As can be readily seen, the prior art glow plug of Figure 5 has a base 48 which is cross-hatched in Figure 7 and is of a far smaller area. Thus, the force on an area of the base of applicant's plug is spread out over a far greater area to permit increased tightening without deformation as explained in applicant's specification.


The examiner has titled reference character 12 of Brooks, et al. as the base. Claims 1 and 2, as amended, define the base as that portion which contacts the engine block. As shown in Figure 5 of Brooks, et al., base 12 does not contact the engine block. Furthermore, amended claim 1 requires that the hexagonal portion extend downwardly to terminate with the base whereby the external shape of the base is hexagonal as shown in Figure 4 of applicant's drawings.

Brooks does not show this. The portion of Brooks's glow plug which contacts the engine block is indicated by reference character 16 in Figure 1.

The examiner rejected claim 3 as obvious over Brooks in view of Bhat, et al. (4,088,105). Bhat, in Figures 1 and 2, shows a hexagonal portion 11 which terminates about half way down the body of the plug. This is similar to the prior art shown in applicant's Figure 5. Bhat, et al. teaches a hexagonal section which ends well above the base 17.

It is thus believed that applicant's claims as amended are not anticipated or suggested by the references of record and allowance of all claims is believed clearly proper.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edgar W. Averill, Jr.", with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

EDGAR W. AVERILL, JR.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 24,752

Averill & Varn
8244 Painter Avenue
Whittier, CA 90602
(562) 698-8039